

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 5, and 10 have been amended herein, and the Specification has been amended to address non-substantive errors of form. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter and have adequate support throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Otherwise, Applicant respectfully traverses all claim rejections for the reasons that follow:

I. REJECTION OF CLAIM 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1ST PARAGRAPH

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for containing subject matter which was not adequately described in the Specification.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to address the Examiner's concerns. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter and have adequate support throughout the Specification, for example, as illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

II. DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6 AND 10

Claims 1-6 and 10 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,705,133 to Avganim (hereinafter "Avganim"). Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 of the present application, from which claims 2-6 ultimately depend, recites features which are simply not found in any of the claims of Avganim. For example, claim 1 of the present application discloses two unique and patentable features which relate to whether the laptop lock is in a locked or unlocked state:

- IN A LOCKED STATE: "the arm of cable plug and the locking portion of the lock body cooperate with one another **to form an enclosed area . . . for constraining an object . . . within the enclosed area,**" and
- IN AN UNLOCKED STATE: "**the arm of the cable plug is slidably positioned away from the locking portion of the lock body, so that the object attached to or part of the laptop may be removed from the area.**"

Claim 10 recites similar features – i.e., "means for forming an enclosed area in the locked state to constrain an object attached to or part of the laptop within the enclosed area, and for permitting the object to be removed from the area in the unlocked state."

Claim 1 of Avganim recites a "cord entrapment" in general, but does not recite the critical and patentable features of claim 1 of the present application – i.e., **an enclosed area** that is formed in a locked state to "[constrain] an object . . . within the enclosed area," nor does claim 1 of Avganim recite that "the arm of the cable plug is slidably positioned away from the locking portion of the lock body" in an unlocked state so that "the object attached to or part of the laptop may be removed from the area." Furthermore, none of claims 2-14 of the '133 patent cure the critical deficiencies of claim 1 of the '133 patent.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 and 10 of the present application are patentably distinct from claims 1-14 of the '133 patent. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the double patenting rejections of claims 1-6 and 10 be withdrawn.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 10 was rejected as under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by German Patent Application DE 3407723 ("DE '723").

Applicant has amended claim 10 to positively recite a "laptop." It is respectfully submitted that DE '723 does not disclose a "laptop," and as such, does not anticipate claim 10 as amended herein. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

IV. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-4 AND 7-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,881,582 to Monaco (hereinafter "Monaco"); and claims 1-4, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,931,607 to McFarland (hereinafter "McFarland"). Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 recites "a lock body **configured to be coupled to a laptop**." Claim 10 has been amended herein to positively recite a "laptop," which is simply not disclosed by Monaco.

Monaco discloses a multi-purpose lockout device for preventing unauthorized use of a machine (Monaco; Abstract). The lockout device of Monaco is a free floating device which is configured to receive cables, but not configured to couple to a machine, much less a laptop, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Monaco does not disclose a "laptop," as positively recited within claim 10. McFarland discloses a quick release cable support clamp. However, like the lockout device of Monaco, the cable support clamp McFarland is not "**configured to be coupled to a laptop**," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, it is believed that laptops were not in existence at the time McFarland was filed.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Monaco and McFarland. Furthermore, since claims 2-4 and 7-9 ultimately depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over Monaco and McFarland for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejections of claims 1-4 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

V. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6 AND 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,928 to Galant (hereinafter "Galant"). Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

Claims 1 and 10, as amended herein, each recite "a cable attached to the cable plug."

Galant discloses a security device for securing a laptop computer. The security device includes a lock device and a rigid first securing member having a leg, and restraining

members defining an elongate opening through which the monitor portion of the laptop computer can be slidably received when the laptop computer is in an open position. The leg extends from the first securing member for insertion through a predetermined hole provided through the desk top. The leg is configured to couple to the lock device to prevent separation of the first securing member from the desk top when the lock device is locked. A second securing member can be interlocked with the rigid first securing member in order to secure a closed laptop computer to the desk top. (Galant; Abstract).

It is respectfully submitted that Galant does not disclose a "a cable attached to the cable plug," as recited in claims 1 and 10. As described above, Galant discloses a rigid securing member that defines an opening to receive a laptop monitor. This reference does not disclose a cable, much less "a cable attached to the cable plug."

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Galant. Furthermore, since claims 2-6 ultimately depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over Galant for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejections of claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

VI. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 8 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over McFarland in view of Monaco. Respectfully, Applicant traverses.

As described above with respect to the anticipation rejections of claims 1-4 and 7-10, neither McFarland nor Monaco discloses critical features of claim 1, from which claims 8 and 9 ultimately depend. Specifically, neither McFarland nor Monaco discloses "a lock body **configured to be coupled to a laptop.**"

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of McFarland and Monaco does not render obvious the subject matter of claim 1, from which claims 8 and 9 ultimately depend. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejections of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

VII. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are currently in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on June 16, 2005.

Bryan N. DeMatteo

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative


Signature

June 16, 2005

Date of Signature

MM:BND/lf

Respectfully submitted,


Bryan N. DeMatteo

Registration No.: 51,608

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700